UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,079	04/13/2001	Songxiang Wei	16440.4011	3866

34313 7590 01/08/2007

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT
4 PARK PLAZA
SUITE 1600
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558

EXAMINER	
ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/835,079	WEI, SONGXIANG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shawki S. Ismail	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6-10,14-18 and 22-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6-10,14-18 and 22-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This communication is responsive to the communication received on October 5, 2006.

Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 14-18, and 22-45 are pending.

Previous Rejection Maintained

2. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on July 5, 2006. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive; therefore, the previous rejection is maintained

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1, 2, 6-10, 14-18, and 22-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boss et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,758,110.

5. As to claim 1 and 2, Boss teaches a method for sharing an application, the method comprising:

determining a position and a size of a shared application window displayed in a presenter screen by monitoring and intercepting function calls made by the shared application to a Graphics Device Interface (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29, col. 4, lines 49-58);

determining a position and a size of a non-shared application window displayed in the presenter screen by monitoring function calls made by the non-shared application (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29);

if the non-shared application window overlaps the shared application window in a region of the presenter screen, determining a position and a size of art the overlapping region (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29);

capturing a screen shot of an image corresponding to the shared application window (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29); and

transmitting the screen shot and information for the position and size of the overlapping region to generate a viewer screen (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29).

6. As to claims 2, Boss teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

transmitting the position and the size of the shared application window to a viewer (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29).

7. As to claim 6, Boss teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

determining whether the position or the size of the shared application window has changed by monitoring function calls made by the shared application (see Fig. 8, 9, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29); and

if the position or the size of the shared application window has changed, determining a new position or a new size of the shared application window (see Fig. 8, 9, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29).

8. As to claim 7, Boss teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

periodically capturing the image corresponding to the shared application window (col. 2, lines 57-67, col. 5, lines 24-39).

9. As to claim 8, Boss teaches the method of claim 7 further comprising:

periodically transmitting the captured image to a viewer (col. 2, lines 57-67, col. 5, lines 24-39).

10. As to claims 9-10, 14-18, and 22-41, they contain similar limitations as above; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Boss et al.**, U.S. Patent No. **5,758,110** and in view of **"Official Notice".**

13. As to claims 42-43, Boss teaches the invention as claimed above. Boss does not explicitly teach wherein the function calls by the shared application include a GetRandomRgn function. And wherein the GetRandomRgn function comprises a iNum value of 4.

Applicant's disclosure states that Microsoft Corp. first published the GetRandomRgn function prototype with the release of Windows 2000. The publication

stated that iNum must be SYSRGN (a predefined value). "Official Notice" is taken that the iNum value of 4 is equal to the SYSRGN and it is the only value documented and defined for this function.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use the value of 4 (SYSRGN) as the iNum value in the GetRandomRgn function in order to accurately determine the visible region of a window.

14. Claim 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Boss et al.**, U.S. Patent No. **5,758,110** and in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art **(AAPA).**

15. As to claim 44, it contains similar limitation as in claim 1 above. Boss teaches sharing graphic application but does not specifically teach OpenGl API based application.

AAPA teach OpenGL API based applications (OpenGl is a well-known application program interface (API) that is used by applications to draw graphics on a presenter's computer screen, page 22 lines 24 – page 23 line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boss with the teachings of AAPA in order to facilitate shared applications having the OpenGl APIs at the presenter's client computer.

16. As to claim 45, it contains similar limitation as in claim 1 above. Boss teaches sharing graphic application but does not specifically teach DirectDraw API based application.

AAPA teaches DirectDraw API based applications (DirectDraw is a well-known application program interface (API) that is used by applications to draw graphics on a presenter's computer screen, page 22 lines 24 – page 23 line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boss with the teachings of AAPA in order to facilitate shared applications having the DirectDraw APIs at the presenter's client computer.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant argues in substance that:

Boss does not meet the scope of the claim limitation of determining the position and size of at he shared application by intercepting function calls made by the shared application to the Graphics Device interface.

When the application 101 calls graphical device interface 102 to perform a drawing, graphical device interface 102 calls display driver 104. Further display driver 104 performs the prompted drawings on display device 106 of host system 100. The function call that is intercepted is the same function call that initially was made by the application 101 to graphical device interface 102 (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 29, col. 4, lines 49-58). The claims limitation fails to specify that the interception of the function call is executed prior to any processing by the GDI. Specifying that the interception of the calls happen prior to any processing by the GDI would clearly define the scope of the claimed subjected matter and possibly overcome the cited prior art.

The claim as currently presented merely recites intercepting function calls made by the shared application to the Graphics Device interface and this is clearly done by the application sharing apparatus of Boss and thus meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

18. *THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL*. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
December 20, 2006

Bharat Barot.

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER